



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/206,216	12/05/1998	JEAN-PIERRE DATH	F-721	5195
25264	7590	02/06/2004	EXAMINER	
FINA TECHNOLOGY INC PO BOX 674412 HOUSTON, TX 77267-4412			NGUYEN, TAM M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1764	
DATE MAILED: 02/06/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/206,216

Applicant(s)

DATH ET AL.

Examiner

Tam M. Nguyen

Art Unit

1764

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: _____

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Walter D. Griffin
Walter D. Griffin
Primary Examiner

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The argument that it is estimated that, in table 2 of Glockner, diene content in the product stream at ten hours on stream would be approximately 6.15% when the olefinic stream comprises about 60 vol. % is not persuasive because Glockner teaches that the olefinic feed comprises about 0.1 to 70 % of diene (see col. 1, lines 65 through col. 2, line 2) . When an olefinic feedstock comprises about .5% or 0.1 %, the product would comprise less than .1 wt.% as claimed.

The argument that table 4 of Colombo is stated with respect to the product components for which the selectivity values are presented and no figures are given for the product yield of isobutene and there is no basis in Colombo to assume 22.7 g of isobutene passed through the reactor without change is not persuasive because the conversion rate of 77.3 % is the rate at which olefins are cracked and there is no evidence in example 25 to show that the isobutene comprises butadiene. Therefore, the calculation is valid.

The argument that Cosyns is directed to the selective hydrogenation of a C2-C3 hydrocarbon fraction while the Colombo reference is directed to the conversion of C4+ hydrocarbons, and thus there would be no reason for one of skill in the art to look to Cosyns for hydrogenation of dienes is not persuasive because the examiner uses the Cosyns reference to show that the step of hydrogenation of dienes in an olefinic stream is well known in the art whether the olefin is a heavy olefin or a light olefin.